

aspect of its participation in the battle against illicit drug use. The National Guard participates in the two pronged attack to reduce drug use in our country—simultaneously attacking supply and demand. The Drug Demand Reduction Program (DDR) focuses on education and information about the effects of narcotic use so that individuals will be less likely to turn to drugs. The Guard implements this program through its education work with school children. Already in this year alone, members of the California National Guard have spoken to 123,550 people, 82% of them school-age children and 74% of them in the 8th grade or below. This is particularly important, Mr. Speaker, because studies have shown that the earlier you teach children the dangers of drug use, the greater the chance that the child will embrace that message.

The second element of the California Guard's anti-drug program involves removing the supply of drugs from our streets. To this end, the Guard provides support and assistance to local law enforcement agencies in getting the drugs off of the streets. From flight surveillance to assisting local police officers in raids of methamphetamine plants, the California Guard has been involved in numerous seizures of illegal narcotics. This past year alone, in actions supported by the California Guard, law enforcement officials have seized over 8,100 lbs. of cocaine, 750 lbs. of heroin, 1,800 lbs. of methamphetamine, 360 lbs. of opium, 414,677 marijuana plants and 261 lbs. of processed marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the vital efforts of the California National Guard in reducing illicit drugs on our streets and educating of our youth about the perils of drug use. Thanks to their diligent efforts, our state and our nation are a better place.

RECOGNIZING THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I send my best wishes and congratulations to Republic of China President Chen Shui-bian and his people on the occasion of their 89th National Day. In recent years, Taiwan has prospered. It has one of the strongest economies in the world and its people enjoy unprecedented prosperity. Taiwan has solid schools, a good transportation system and sound health care. Furthermore, the people of Taiwan enjoy many political freedoms such as direct elections, a free press, and human rights.

I commend Taiwan on their 89th National Day. Their people have every right to be proud on this momentous occasion.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EL CAMINO REAL DE TIERRA ADENTRO NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2000

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the sponsor of the House bill of S. 366, El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail Act.

This trail has a great deal of importance to the Southwest. El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (the Royal Road of the Interior), served as the primary route between the colonial Spanish capital of Mexico City and the Spanish provincial capitals at San Juan de Los Caballeros (1598–1600), San Gabriel (1600–1609) and then Santa Fe (1610–1821). The portion of El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro that resided in what is now the United States extended between El Paso, Texas and present San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico, a distance of 404 miles. El Camino Real is a symbol of the cultural interaction between nations and ethnic groups and of the commercial exchange that made possible the development and growth of the borderland. American Indian groups dating back into prehistoric times, especially the Pueblo Indians of the Rio Grande river valley, use the area and trail along the Rio Grande long before Europeans arrived.

In 1598, Don Juan de Onate led a Spanish military expedition along those trails to establish the northern portion of El Camino Real, and during the Mexican National Period and part of the U.S. Territorial Period, El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro facilitated the emigration of people to New Mexico and other areas that would become the United States.

This trail is important to the history of the borderlands as it was central to the exploration, conquest, colonization, settlement, religious conversion, and military occupation of the Southwest. Many people used the trail including American Indians, European emigrants, miners, ranchers, soldiers, and missionaries. These travelers promoted cultural interaction among Spaniards, other Europeans, American Indians, Mexicans, and Americans. El Camino Real fostered the spread of Catholicism, mining, an extensive network of commerce, and ethnic and cultural traditions including music, folklore, medicine, foods, architecture, language, place names, irrigation systems, and Spanish law. This trail is important to the cultural history and rich heritage of the Southwest.

S. 366 amends the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro as a National Historic Trail. This non-controversial legislation prohibits the acquisition of any lands or interests outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area for El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro except with the consent of the owner. The bill has already passed in the House in a similar form. I am pleased that this bill, which is identical to the House bill which I originally introduced, has again made it to the floor.

I would like to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MILLER. I would also like to

October 4, 2000

thank Congressman HANSEN and my colleague Mr. SKEEN for allowing this clean bill to come to the House floor. I know that the designation of the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, as a part of the National Historic Trails System, will benefit a great many people.

I hope my colleagues will support me in the passage of this legislation.

S. 1198: THE TRUTH IN REGULATING ACT

HON. DAVID M. MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the House's passage yesterday of S. 1198, the Truth in Regulating Act of 2000. This bipartisan, good government bill establishes within the Legislative Branch a much needed regulatory analysis function. This function is intended to enhance congressional responsibility for regulatory decisions developed under the laws Congress enacts.

I want to especially thank Small Business Subcommittee Chairwoman on Regulatory Reform and Paperwork Reduction SUE KELLY for her initiation of this concept and her tenacious determination over a several year period to reach yesterday's successful result. Since 1998, the House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, which I chair, held two hearings and issued two House Reports (H. Rept. 105–441, Part 2 and H. Rept. 106–772) in support of a Congressional office of regulatory analysis.

Yesterday, during the floor debate on S. 1198, Vice Chairman PAUL RYAN expressed Congressional intent for this bill and presented the multi-year House legislative history. I want to emphasize three points which Mr. RYAN made. Also, I want to express my differing view about two statements made by Subcommittee Ranking Member DENNIS KUCINICH.

First, I agree with Mr. RYAN about the importance of the General Accounting Office's (GAO's) submitting timely comments on proposed rules during the public comment period, while there is still an opportunity to influence the cost, scope and content of an agency's regulatory proposal. S. 1198 does not require GAO to submit timely comments but neither does it preclude GAO for doing so. Second, I agree with Mr. RYAN about GAO's responsibility to examine non-agency (i.e., "public") data and analyses in preparing its 'independent evaluation' of an agency's regulatory proposal. Sometimes the best way to determine if an agency has ignored Congressional intent or failed to consider less costly or non-regulatory alternatives is to review non-agency analyses. S. 1198 does not require GAO to review public data but neither does it preclude GAO from doing so. Third, I agree with Mr. RYAN that GAO should comment substantively on an agency's regulatory proposal. S. 1198 does not require GAO to comment on the scope and content of an agency's regulatory proposal but neither does it preclude GAO from doing so.